

Please provide the best dicamba contact for your state.

Name

Doug Owens

Alyssa Foss

Joshua Stamper

Jenny Wren

DAVID SCOTT

Ryan King

Liza Fleeson Trossbach

Patrick Jones

Damardray Williams

Christopher Wade

Brian Verhougstraete

JD Farley

Michael Williams

Donald Gilbert

Mike McConville

Dawn Wall

Tim Creger

Michael Ledlow

Jack Peterson

Tony Cofer

Rob Hofstetter

Agency	Address	Address 2	City/Town	State/Province
Illinois Dept. of Agriculture				IL
WI Dept. of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection				WI
Minnesota Department of Agriculture				Minnesota
Georgia Department of Agriculture				GA
Office of Indiana state Chemist				IN
Ohio Dept of Ag				Ohio
Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services				Virginia
NC Dept. of Ag. & Consumer Services				NC
Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food, and Forestry				OKLAHOMA
Delaware Department of Ag.				DE
MDARD				Michigan
SD Dept of Ag				SD
Kentucky Department of Agriculture				Kentucky
PA Dept of Agriculture				PA
NJDEP				NJ
Missouri Department of Ag				Mo
Nebraska Department of Agriculture				Nebraska
Mississippi Dept of Ag				MS
				Arizona
Alabama Dept. of Ag and Industries				AL
MD Dept. of Ag, Pesticide Regulation				MD

ZIP/Postal Code	Country	Email Address	Phone Number
		doug.owens@illinois.gov	217-785-2850
		alyssa.foss@wisconsin.gov	608-224-4547
		joshua.stamper@state.mn.us	651-398-2488
		jwren333@gmail.com	4047836990
		scottde@purdue.edu	7654131242
		ryan.king@agri.ohio.gov	614-728-6394
		liza.fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov	804-371-6559
		patrick.jones@ncagr.gov	336 496 7106
		damardray.williams@ag.ok.gov	(405) 522-5981
		Christopher.wade@delaware.gov	302-698-4570
		verhougstraeteb@michigan.gov	517-582-4573
		joseph.farley@state.sd.us	605.773.4432
		Michael.R.Williams@ky.gov	502-782-9240
		dgilbert@pa.gov	717-772-5214
		Mike.McConville@dep,nj.gov	609-984-6513
		Dawn.Wall@mda.mo.gov	(573) 751-5510
		tim.creger@nebraska.gov	402-471-6882
		Michael1@mdac.ms.gov	6625717899
		jpetereson@azda.gov	6025423575
		tony.cofer@agi.alabama.gov	3342407237
		rob.hofstetter@maryland.gov	410-841-5710

Number of reported dicamba incidents (probable and confirmed).	
Open-Ended Response	
	151
1- probable	116
	0
	73
	15
	1
	0
	2
	0
	12
	17
	4
	2
none	102
	63
	3
	0
	2
	0

Please include additional details for Q2 in the comment box.

Open-Ended Response

Illinois has received 151 pesticide misuse complaints. 45 investigations are complete and under evaluation by enforcement. NA

• Of the 116 complaints; 62 have asked for investigations and 54 have not • All of the investigations are still ongoing; alleged N/A

15 total alleged complaints

Complaint alleging damage to trees and shrubs on residential property from application of Engenia Herbicide, EPA Reg. NA
n/a

No additional details

N/A

We are hearing that there is A LOT more damage that is not being reported. We are considering a process for reporting damage. 17 alleged dicamba cases reported. Investigations are still on going, and pending sample results to confirm dicamba.

2 complaints filed for damage to non DT soybeans, other 2 for damage to tobacco

Two incidents reported from 2017 to present (8/26/20). Both occurred in August 2019.

NA

18 CASES WERE REPORTS OF DAMAGE ONLY, NOT INVESTIGATED. 15 CASES WERE DETERMINED TO BE MINOR LEAF CUP

Engenia drift to homeowner site and the other to hemp

Estimated acres impacted (soybeans or cotton).	
Open-Ended Response	
10,000	
45 acres- soybeans	
9,371 acres of soybeans	
N/A	
unknown	
Unknown	
Unknown number of trees or shrubs.	0
NA	0
	200
unknown	250
Unknown	
unknown - none reported at this time in NJ	
over 20,000 acres	
DATA NOT COLLECTED, ESTIMATED AT OVER 10,000 ACRES OF SOYBEANS	140
N/A	

Please include additional details for Q4 in the comment box below.

Open-Ended Response

No additional comments

NA

• This count includes other crops then soybeans • This number is gained from what is reported to the Minnesota Departm

N/A

NA

n/a

No additional details

n/a

Unknown at this time how many acres are impacted

10 acres of burley with damage

None

NA

INSPECTORS, CROP ADVISORS, APPLICATORS AND UNIVERSITY CROP SPECIALISTS AGREE THAT THE DEGREE OF SOYBEAN

N/A

Would you characterize the signs of injury/symptoms on impacted soybeans or cotton as:

Response

Consistent?

Consistent?

Variable?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Variable?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Consistent?

Comments:

Consistent light cupping of soybean leaves

•Consistent with known symptomology of dicamba damage. •Cases are variable in the distribution of damage on the la
N/A

Observed symptoms to soybeans all appeared the same, regardless of intensity or percent of field impacted.

Reports appear to indicate that entire fields are affected, possible volatility.

No injury/symptoms to soybeans or cotton. Curling leaves consistent on impacted trees and shrubs.

N/A

No additional comments

Damage seems to mostly be variable and not consistent with drift.

Consistent with typical symptoms of leaf curl in new growth

None

NA

EXPERIENCES IN 2020 ARE SIMILAR TO PREVIOUS YEARS WHERE MOST FIELDS HAVE CONSISTENT LEAF CUPPING SYMPTC

N/A

Number of reported dicamba incidents (probable and confirmed) that impact or injure a high value or specialty

Open-Ended Response

None verified.

No reported incidents

•1-Forbs, Vegetables-1, Apple Trees-1, Ornamentals-1, Maple Trees-1, Corn-1, Garden-1, Grapes-1

0

Only one confirmed garden exposure. the rest were soybeans.

1 complaint from a vineyard.

NA

0

None

0

None

0

2 claims impacting tobacco, estimated value at \$40-\$50,000

None

NA

TWO CLAIMS INVOLVED IMPACTS ON ORGANIC SOYBEANS, WHICH ARE A CONSIDERED SPECIALTY CROP IN OUR STATE.

none

Hemp- Unknown could be up to \$150,000

Number of reported dicamba incidents (probable and confirmed) that impact or injure a plant/animal/person/site

Open-Ended Response

Over several years, statewide there have been reports of a decrease in tree health. Pesticide drift has been alleged as a cause.

No reported incidents

See Response to question 7.

0

1

None.

1 (see above)

0

None

0

none

0

NA

None

NA

0

THREE CLAIMS INVOLVE IMPACTS ON DECIDUOUS TREES.

1

1 homeowner site-garden and ornamentals

Number of reported dicamba incidents (probable and confirmed) that impact water quality and/or ESA. Please
--

Open-Ended Response

None known.

No reported incidents

1)No direct water quality impact complaints. 2)One complaint listed waterway between the target field and the damage

0

0

None

NA

0

None

0

None

0

NA

None

NA

0

NO CLAIMS INVOLVE EITHER WATER QUALITY OR ESA CLAIMS.

0

0

Estimated total cost of your 2020 dicamba investigations, including staff time, travel, lab analysis and enforcement

Open-Ended Response

Estimated cost \$125,000

Estimated \$1200

Inspection staff: To date ~\$55,000 assuming 1/3 of the way through total 55,000x3= \$165,000 Lab \$26,520 NonPoint \$0

35% of our total annual pesticide enforcement budget.

Unknown at this time. Still processing cases.

Investigation is not yet complete. Estimate not available.

n/a

N/A

0

Not able to calculate at this time as all the investigations are still active/open.

\$80,000 estimated. This number will more than likely increase due to investigations still ongoing at this time.

NA

Unknown

NA

ESTIMATED 1,000 WORK HOURS AT \$25/HR = \$25,000 PLUS LAB COSTS OF APPROXIMATELY \$10,000.

5000

\$2,000

Have you implemented any state restrictions or program efforts related to OTT use of dicamba products?
--

Response

Yes

No

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

No

Yes

No

No

No

Yes

Yes

No

No

No

No

Yes

No

No

comments

Illinois had a 24 (c) SLN label for the four dicamba products in 2020. The major restrictions were a June 25, 2020 cutoff c

June 20th Application cutoff date through a 24c SLN label

24c registration to require specified training program completion

June 20, 2020 application cutoff date. Reduced number of dicamba off-target movement complaints in 2020 as compared

We updated our website to include the most current information. We also sent out an update sheet to applicators.

SLN labels for mandatory in-person training conducted by NCSU Weed Scientists

No additional comments

SD implemented a June 30th cut off date

Prior to Ninth Circuit Court ruling, restricted to 45 days after planting.

Have any of these shown to be effective in mitigating off target movement or reports of off target movement?
--

Response

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

Yes

No

Yes

comments

We believe so. In 2019, Illinois received 723 dicamba related complaints. With the new restrictions (earlier cutoff date at NA

The June 20th cut-off date is based on the MDA's ongoing investigations and informal surveys into reports of crop damage

2020 as compared to average annual complaints in 2017-2019 as follows: -2017 thru 2019... 246 avg. annual ground drift

Overall our complaints are down, but that may be due to the fact that the products are no longer registered.

NA

N/A

n/a

Since the SDDA has issued a cut off date of June 30th, there has been less investigations reported to the SDDA, however,

NA

NA

NO STATE RESTRICTIONS WERE IMPLEMENTED.

N/A

What label language do you find most problematic? Insert language here along with potential fix.

Open-Ended Response

and the temperature restriction) in 2020, our complaints were down to 151.

At the time of survey completion- WI does not find label language to be problematic

1. The tight window of application within winds of 3 mph to 10 mph. The language is also not consistent in example, the l

1. Documenting planting date, which is insignificant relative to your neighbor's planting date. Set a regionally flexible app
No response.

Given the small number of cases, unable to identify the most problematic label language. Defer to AAPCO SFIREG Dicam
Downwind restrictions for specialty crops - Applications should not be allowed near specialty crops regardless of wind dii
None

the SDDA is aware of issues not being reported to the SDDA.

Language related to off-target movement and volatilization of product

NA

NON-APPLICATION ASPECTS OF RECORD KEEPING ARE IMPOSSIBLE TO COMPLY WITH, SUCH AS SENSITIVE SITE SURVEY A
Nothing

Can you estimate the rate of adoption of the planting of dicamba tolerant crops in your state (percentage of ac

Open-Ended Response

Estimate 60 percent DT.

Estimated range of 40 to 60%

Low-moderate confidence of between 60-70% of acres at DT beans.

Cotton is probably 90%. Soybean is roughly 75%.

unknown

Unknown

Unknown.

62% of Soybeans and 56% of cotton acreage

Unknown

25-35%

Estimate that 60-75% of SB acres are planted to DT varieties

Unknown

NA

STATE AGENCY CANNOT ESTIMATE THIS NUMBER, BUT THE STATE UNIVERSITY HAS TRIED, AND ESTIMATES BETWEEN 60
90%

I am checking with the UofA and will respond with what I find out.

Cotton = 510,000 – 530,000 acres with 85% adoption Soybeans = 325,000 – 375,000 acres with 85% adoption

60+ Soybeans